

----- Original Message -----

Subject: FHMIA: Alternative View: PLAN B - VOTE NO ON QUESTION 1

From: <info@fhmia.org>

Date: Mon, May 05, 2014 6:03 pm

FHMIA Email Members,

Below is an alternative view to the Little Pond sewerage issue, as published in the Enterprise on 5/2/14, page 5, and sent to us by the authors.

This is for informational purposes only. The FHMIA Board has not met since the Ballot was announced and takes no position on Question 1.

We encourage you do do your own research on this most important issue impacting our community.

Please attend or watch the Board of Selectman meeting tonight, 5/5, and attend the meeting on 5/12 (see separate announcement) at Teaticket Elementary School. (www.fctv.org, streaming at 7:00 PM).

Subcommittee on Email and Website, FHMIA

-----Original Message-----

From: Janet Kluever

Date: May 4, 2014 10:32:26 PM

Subject: PLAN B - VOTE NO ON QUESTION 1

My name is Janet Kluever and I am the Chair of the Plan B Committee (VOTE NO on QUESTION 1). I am writing to ask you to read the following letter (if you haven't seen it already in the Falmouth Enterprise) and please forward to any of your neighbors and/or association lists so that they can judge for themselves the folly of installing sewers in the Little Pond area.

Also as a reminder, there is a Selectmen's meeting this Monday night during which they will be discussing and informing the public of the details on Question 1. Peter Waasdorf, Earle Barnhart, Ron Zweig and Ron Smolowicz will be attending to counter the Town's position as presented. We urge you to attend and ask pointed questions of them and voice your concerns about the sewer plans.

We appreciate any support you can give us.

Janet Kluever

On the May 20 annual town election ballot not only asks for approval of a whopping \$49.82 million expenditure, but also sets out a particular approach to dealing with the town's serious wastewater issues and nitrogen pollution that degrades its bays and ponds. In town meeting and at various public forums, concerned citizens from all perspectives have offered their considered opinions on how the town should proceed with implementing its Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan. We hope you have had a chance to study these issues and agree with us that Question 1 should not be approved for the following reasons:

1- There is NO state requirement to sewer. Thanks to the hard work of the Water Quality Management Committee and its inclusion of alternatives to sewers, the state has altered its guidelines for comprehensive wastewater planning to include adaptive management and alternative approaches to sewers.

2- There is NO state mandated deadline. The DEP only requires that progress be made in a town's wastewater planning efforts. That means that Falmouth can take time to actually test alternatives and implement successful ones that are more cost effective and efficient before resorting to sewers.

3- Time is not necessarily our enemy. Everyone agrees that we need to address wastewater issues now. But over the past 3 years, analysis of needs and study of alternatives has reduced a \$600 million sewer plan to a situation where some options appear viable that cost little or possibly even make money. Capital costs certainly have increased over time; but, over that time, new innovations have been identified and developed contributing to large cost reductions in wastewater management. New ones are being tested and proven all the time. Substantive progress continues in Falmouth, meeting all necessary DEP requirements. In fact, Falmouth is far ahead of all other towns on the Cape.

4- The "window of opportunity of retired debt" is really just a proposal to borrow money now to pay for a sewer instead of many other worthy town needs. All our impaired water bodies eventually must be addressed and fixed. We need to apply the most cost efficient methods for wastewater management to allow for optimal use of precious public funds for all municipal needs -- e.g, cleaning all our estuaries and ponds as well as roads, schools, pensions, health insurance, etc.

5- Citizens should have the right to vote on each section of Question 1 separately. State-required repairs to the existing sewers and sewer plant upgrades deserve a separate question, separated from optional wastewater projects such as sewer system expansion and inlet widening. The Board of Selectmen should trust the discretion of voters to judge each on its own merits.

6- Alternatives can offer faster remedies than sewers to reduce the nitrogen loading of our waters. While sewers would stop the new flows of nitrogen from existing houses, "legacy pollution" already in the ground will continue to flow towards the bays at 1-3 feet per day, adding nitrogen for years to come. Many alternative solutions like oyster beds, floating vegetative beds, phyto-buffers, bio-cord etc., act directly and immediately on the polluted waters. These natural system based technologies also restore the natural aquatic eco-systems, which sewer technology does not.

7- Betterment of \$640 or more, plus costs of hooking up to sewers, changing plumbing, destroying septic tanks, repairing landscape, maintenance and electricity for pumps and annual sewer bills will burden many low and fixed income residents of Maravista who can least afford it. Also, many legal limits and conditions by banks, mortgage holders and low-interest loan programs may restrict these residents from benefits such as senior citizens delaying betterments until the sale of a property. These limitations could possibly force people out of their homes.

8- We need to know the carbon costs of any major future infrastructure projects. We need to consider all costs of any new sewer project, by a life-cycle analysis, including the damage of greenhouse gases. As a recent report from the International Panel on Climate Change makes clear, climate change is a real threat to human life and society, and Cape Cod will both contribute to and suffer from its major effects.

9- Sewers are NOT the best technology for improving the environment. EPA has determined that sewers cause unintended damage to the environment [pollution, CO2 emissions, pharmaceuticals], result in loss of resources and nutrients, have the highest costs for operating and maintenance and

are a larger public health risk than other alternative technologies.

10- There is a Plan B, if sewers are voted down:

- Implement state-required repairs
- Implement resilient, cost effective, natural system based technologies that are already in the CWMP (such as seasonal oysters) and are better and faster.
- Adapt to emerging new technologies and tools of analysis as needed.

The bottom line is: spending millions of dollars now for sewers eliminates any meaningful trial of alternatives, but trying least cost alternatives now does not eliminate future spending for sewers if needed.

Please vote NO on Question 1.

If you would like to help in our efforts to defeat Question 1, please contact us at above address. Donations can be made to "Plan B Committee" and sent to the address below.

Lawn signs will be available soon— let us know if you would like one or more to display.

Thanks for your consideration,

Plan B Committee
Janet Kluever, Chair
Peter Waasdorp, Treasurer
57 Beccles Road
Falmouth, MA 02540